## 

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	) Case No. CR
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT FILED
Bonning Befendant.	APR 112014
Befendant.	RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COLIFT
y the continuance outweigh the best interest of t	non April 1, 2014, the Court excludes time under the 30 pt., 2014 and finds that the ends of justice served the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § d bases this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance work See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ald be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the or law, that it is unreasonable to ex-	elex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial ished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	ald deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, f due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	ald unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given mmitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
	ald unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time a, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.  DATED: 4\1\4	JOSEPH & SPERO United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney